

**SECTION M**  
**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.1. BASIS OF EVALUATION**

M.1.1. General

M.1.1.1. This is a competitive source selection and will be conducted in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and applicable supplements. The Government has established a Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) to evaluate proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposals (RFP). Proposals will be evaluated by the SSEB using the evaluation factors and subfactors identified below. The source selection resulting from this RFP will be based on the proposal submission determined to be the best overall value to the Government, price and other factors considered.

Proposals will be reviewed for completeness and compliance with the Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposals that do not include the required information or do not comply with preparation instructions may be rejected.

M.1.1.2. Proposals which are unrealistic in terms of technical capability or are unrealistically high or low in price will be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of failure to comprehend the proposed contractual requirements and will be rejected.

**M.2. EVALUATION FACTORS**

M.2.1. Factor 1 - Management

M.2.2. Factor 2 - Technical Approach

M.2.2.1. Subfactor 1 - Operation of the TRICARE Retiree Dental Program

M.2.2.2. Subfactor 2 - Customer Service

M.2.3. Factor 3 - Proposal Risk

M.2.4. Factor 4 - Past Performance

M.2.5. Factor 5 - Price

**M.3. EVALUATION FACTOR RELATIVE VALUES**

M.3.1. Management, Technical Approach and Past Performance are all equally important; Technical Approach subfactors 1 and 2 are equally weighted and will be assigned a single combined evaluation rating.

M.3.2. Proposal Risk will consider the level of risk associated with the entire proposal.

M.3.3. All evaluation factors, other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

M.3.4. Offerors should be aware that if competing proposals are determined essentially equal in terms of nonprice factors, the Government may determine that the best value decision is the lowest priced offer. Additionally, the Government may make tradeoffs between proposal risk, management and technical factors, past performance and price when determining which offer constitutes the best value to the Government. This tradeoff process may result in an award to other than the low priced offer or other than the proposal with the highest nonprice factor rating.

**SECTION M**  
**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.4. EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT**

M.4.1. In order for a proposal to receive consideration under this evaluation factor, the offeror must submit all plans required in Section L. The Government will evaluate the plans submitted. This evaluation will be considered in the overall Management rating.

M.4.2. The following will be considered in the evaluation of Management:

M.4.2.1. From the Oral Presentation:

M.4.2.1.1. the offeror's overall approach and strategies for the management and oversight of workload, contract performance, and efforts toward achievement of continuous excellence in the performance of the requirements of the contract.

M.4.2.1.2. lines of authority,

M.4.2.1.3. reporting interfaces between the offeror and the Government,

M.4.2.1.4. timely and substantive coordination with the Government,

M.4.2.1.5. subcontract management effort to provide effective subcontract management,

M.4.2.2. From the Written Proposal:

M.4.2.2.1. The following required plans will be incorporated into the resulting contract:

M.4.2.2.2. Quality Control Plan And Procedures, to include how the offeror will ensure timely and accurate processing of claims, as well as the proposed methodology for measuring claims processing and correspondence completion timeliness and claims coding and payment accuracy,

M.4.2.2.3. the offeror's Continuity of Operations Plan relative to the offeror's ability to continue operations in case of a catastrophic or unforeseen event,

M.4.2.2.4. the offeror's Appeals Plan,

M.4.2.2.5. the offeror's Subcontracting Plan.

**M.5. EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL APPROACH**

M.5.1. Each technical proposal will be evaluated according to the evaluation subfactors stated herein. Failure to address any of the specified technical subfactor requirements will be considered a weakness. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of how well an offerors' proposed procedures, methods, and delivery of services meet or exceed the Government's minimum requirements as stated in Section C. Where the Government has not specified a quantitative requirement, the Government will evaluate the offeror's qualitative approach. The Government will consider offers that commit to higher performance for any requirement, if the offeror clearly describes the added benefit to the Government. In determining benefit to the Government, evaluators will consider only benefits that accrue to the Government, beneficiaries, and providers. For offerors proposing multiple regions, the offeror quantities will be evaluated for accuracy using the RFP data. Each proposal will be evaluated separately and will be evaluated solely on its own merits.

M.5.1.1. Subfactor 1 - Operation of the TRICARE Retiree Dental Program

**SECTION M**  
**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

M.5.1.2. The following will be evaluated from the Oral Presentation:

M.5.1.2.1. The technical approach and assumptions to be used in meeting the requirements of the statement of work.

M.5.1.2.2. Plans for marketing the program.

M.5.1.2.3. Plans for establishment or enhancement of networks (if proposed) and maintenance of those networks throughout the entire term of the contract.

M.5.1.2.4. Procedures for predetermination of treatment (if proposed), for dental necessity reviews, and for notifying beneficiaries of approved and denied claims.

M.5.1.2.5. Plans for accommodating the increase in volume to the offeror's current business that would result from this prospective contract.

M.5.1.2.6. The methods and strategies which will be employed to minimize total out-of-pocket costs on the part of the enrollee.

M.5.1.3. The following will be evaluated from the Written Proposal:

M.5.1.3.1. If an offeror does not currently have a nationwide dental coverage program in operation, their written plan detailing how they will establish an operational program throughout the geographical scope of this contract, no later than the start of dental care delivery. If an offeror already has a nationwide dental coverage program in operation, their written plan detailing how they will incorporate the TRDP to make it operational throughout the geographical scope of this contract no later than the start of dental care delivery.

M.5.1.3.2. If the offeror proposes a network, their submitted electronic file documenting the numbers and distribution by 5-digit zip code of non-specialty providers will be analyzed. If a network is proposed, it will be evaluated from the perspective that 90 percent of TRDP enrollees residing within the 50 United States and the District of Columbia should have access to a non-specialist network dental care provider within a radius of 35 miles from his/her residence and the ratio of enrollees to dentists in that 35 mile radius should be not greater than 500 to 1, with availability of routine appointments within 21 days of request. In the Government's evaluation of proposals, if an offeror proposes a network, the proposal will be considered to add value based on the degree to which the above stated goal is met or exceeded. Thus, the greater the percentage of enrollees that live in a 35-mile radius area where the ratio of enrollees to dentists is less than 500 to 1, the greater the added value.

M.5.1.3.3. The offerors proposed practices and procedures to effect enrollments, disenrollments and changes in enrollments throughout the life of the contract.

M.5.1.3.4. If the offeror proposes multiple regions, the offeror's apportionment of enrollment quantities will be evaluated for accuracy using the RFP data.

M.5.1.4. Subfactor 2 - Customer Service

**SECTION M**  
**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

M.5.1.4.1. The Government will evaluate the following customer service processes and procedures:

M.5.1.4.1.1. The following will be evaluated from the Oral Presentation:

M.5.1.4.1.1.1. methods and processes for responding to telephone inquiries and written and e-mail inquiries;

M.5.1.4.1.1.2. ability to answer telephone calls in accordance with Section C and the response and blockage standards the offeror commits to achieving and maintaining for both telephone calls and written and electronic correspondence; per paragraphs C.5.2.1. and C.5.3.2.

M.5.1.4.1.1.3. website capabilities and content;

M.5.1.4.1.1.4. the offeror's method of responding to negative feedback and implementing changes in response to that feedback.

M.5.1.4.1.2. No written material will be evaluated with the exception of the oral presentation slides.

**M.6. EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL RISK**

M.6.1. The Government will evaluate the overall proposal risk associated with the offeror's entire proposal. Proposal risk relates to the identification and assessment of the risks associated with an offeror's proposed approach to performing the requirements of this RFP. Proposal risk may be associated with a particular approach, or proposed process, as it relates to the successful achievement of the Government's requirements or the degree to which the Government must expend resources to monitor or manage the risk to avoid unsuccessful performance. Evaluation of proposal risk will take into account both the oral and written portions of the proposal.

**M.7. EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE**

M.7.1. Past performance will be evaluated utilizing the information obtained from past performance documentation furnished with the proposal and information obtained from other sources who may have useful and relevant input. Assessing an offeror's past performance and the past performance of its proposed first-tier subcontractors partners, consortium members and key personnel, as pertinent, is the Government's method of evaluating the credibility of an offeror's proposal and their capability to meet performance requirements.

M.7.2. The Government will evaluate past performance as it relates to fulfilling the requirements of in Section C. The outcome is to determine a confidence level in an offeror's ability to successfully perform all aspects of this requirement. An offeror's description of their past performance and the past performance of its proposed subcontractors, the reports and findings described below, the references provided and those developed by the Government, will be used to develop a performance confidence level. Providing references that cannot be contacted by the Government may result in a neutral past performance rating.

M.7.3. Failure to provide all reviews/investigations/findings, reports, sanctions, admonishments, restrictions, or other positive or negative written material for the prime and all proposed first tier subcontractors, partners, consortium members and key personnel covering the specified time period, may have an adverse impact on the past performance evaluation of an offeror.

**SECTION M**  
**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

M.7.4. If an offeror (including first-tier subcontractors, partners, consortium members and key personnel) has no past performance history relating to the operation of a dental coverage program, the offeror's past performance rating will be neutral and will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably. This rating is neither negative nor positive. Neutral is merely indicative of a lack of prior performance in the area of the operation of a dental coverage program.

M.7.5 If an offeror submits applicable past performance information from first-tier subcontractors, partners, consortium members and key personnel, this information will be considered in rendering a performance confidence rating. An offeror may submit past performance information on its key personnel where no other past performance information is available.

M.7.6 The Government will also utilize their own records relating to first-tier subcontractors, partners, consortium members and key personnel where applicable and relevant. The Government will consider this information in rendering a performance confidence rating. This rating will be based on the employee's role in the company and the amount of past performance the employee had related to the operation of a dental coverage program.

M.7.7. The Government's evaluation will also consider past performance information as it relates to subcontracting with small and disadvantaged businesses, if the offeror has had such experience.

**M.8. EVALUATION OF PRICE**

M.8.1. The offeror's proposal will be evaluated for compliance with the RFP.

M.8.2. The offeror's proposal will be evaluated for reasonableness based on total price. If multiple regions are proposed, the evaluated price for each option period will be calculated by multiplying the proposed fixed monthly premium prices for each type of enrollment for each type of coverage by the offeror's estimated number of enrollees for that region as detailed in the technical proposal, summing all categories for all regions. If a single region approach is proposed, the Government's total estimated number of enrollees (Section J, Attachment 1) will be multiplied by the proposed fixed monthly premiums for each type of enrollment for each type of coverage, summing all categories to determine the total evaluated price for each option period. The total evaluated price will be calculated by adding the evaluated prices for all option periods.

M.8.3. The risk of unbalanced pricing that results in payment of unreasonably high premiums by the enrollee as indicated by price analysis may be considered in making the source selection decision.